

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 7, 15, 17, 18, 20, and 23 are amended. Claim 16 is canceled. Claims 2, 4-6, 8, 13, and 22 were previously canceled. After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1, 3, 7, 9-12, 14, 15, 17-21, and 23-27 are now pending in this application.

I. Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the Examiner Interview which took place with Applicant's representative on January 12, 2011. During the Interview, the cited art was discussed. No agreement as to the allowability of the claims was reached.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

On page 2 of the Office Action, Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended Claim 23 to address this rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 7, 10-12, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,300,887 to Le (hereinafter "Le"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended Claim 1 recites in part:

**establishing a first connection between a first network element
and a mobile node;**

establishing a second connection between the first network element and a second network element in response to a handoff request from the mobile node;

...

receiving, at the first network element, the requested header compression state information from the second network element;
and

receiving, at the first network element via the first connection, a portion of the header compression state information from the mobile node.

(Emphasis added). Claim 7, although of different scope, contains similar elements. In the “Response to Arguments” section of the present Office Action, the Examiner argues that “Lee clearly teaches mobile unit sending the snapshot of the decompression context information to a new network entity/ANI as described on 3:55-4:15. Therefore, new network element/entity, receives a portion of the header compression state information, transmitted from the mobile node **through the Old network entity.**” (Emphasis added). Col 3. line 55 to Col. 4, line 15 of Lee (with emphasis added) states:

The present invention transfers the compression and decompression context information used for compression and decompression of the headers of packets to enable the seamless relocation of compression/decompression functions from a **first old network entity** (ANI_AD) to a **second new network entity** (ANI_AD), i.e. the entity seamlessly continues compression and decompression where the first network entity (ANI_AD) stopped. The invention is applicable to, but is not limited to IP/UDP/RTP header compression.

In a first embodiment of the invention, relocation is concurrent with radio handoff. For the downlink traffic, the first network entity queries the mobile decompressor for its decompression context information. The **mobile decompressor** takes a snapshot of its decompression context information, saves it and **sends a representation of the context information to the first network entity.** **The first network entity derives the in-synchronism**

compression context information, and transmits it to the second network entity which stores the received context information as the context information of the second network entity; the second network entity uses the stored compression context information to compress a header of at least one packet transmitted to the mobile decompressor and the mobile decompressor uses the previously saved decompression context information to decompress the header of the at least one data packet.

Thus, the cited portion above states that the “mobile decompressor takes a snapshot of its decompression context information, saves it and **sends a representation of the context information to the first network entity.**” (Emphasis added). The first network entity in Le is, however, the *old* network entity. The *old* network entity then “derives the in-synchronism compression context information” and transmits it to the *new* entity. Applicant submits that sending decompression context information from the mobile to the old network entity, which derives and transmits in-synchronism compression content information to the net entity cannot be considered equivalent to the claimed “receiving, at the first network element **via the first connection,** a portion of the header compression state information from the mobile node.” (Emphasis added).

In addition, in Claim 1, Applicant claims:

receiving, at the first network element, the requested header compression state information from the second network element;
and

receiving, at the first network element, a portion of the header compression state information from the mobile node.

Le does not show the first network element **both** receiving “the requested header compression state information from the second network element” and receiving “a portion of the header compression state information from the mobile node.” As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 and Claims 7 and 10-12, which depend from Claim 1.

Independent Claim 15 has been amended to include Claim 16. As such, Claim 15 as amended recites:

receiving, at the mobile node, a most recently acknowledged header compression state from the second network element.

Claim 20, although of different scope, contains a similar element. On page 4 of the Office Action, in his discussion of Claim 16, the Examiner points to Fig. 7 and col. 21, lines 1-50 of Le as showing, as the Examiner says: “sending a snapshot of compressed context information to the first/new network node, wherein the information indicates the latest acknowledged FH packet.” However, the claimed feature is not “sending a snapshot of compressed context information to the first/new network node,” but rather “receiving, at the mobile node, a most recently acknowledged header compression state from the second network element.” Le does not show “receiving, at the mobile node, a most recently acknowledged header compression state from the second network element.” As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 15 and Claims 17-20, which depend from Claim 15.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner notes that Claims 3, 9, 14, 21, and 24-27 are allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowability of these claims.

* * *

Applicant submits that, for at least the foregoing reasons, all claims of the present application are patentable over the cited prior art. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 8, 2011

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 23524
Telephone: (608) 258-4292
Facsimile: (608) 258-4258

By 

Paul S. Hunter
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,787